FILED
JUN 27 1974
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

No. 73-1284

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1973

Michael N. Mervin, Petitioner

v.

Federal Trade Commission

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Michael N. Mervin
Attorney pro se
7005 96th Avenue
Seabrook, Md. 20801

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1973

No. 73-1284

Michael N. Marvin, Petitioner

v.

Federal Trade Commission

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR REHEARING

This petition for rehearing is submitted under Rule 58(2).

The denial on May 23, 1974, by the U.S. Court of Appeals of my petition for rehearing clinches the fact I could not believe before that its statement in the judgment of January 16, 1974, attached to my original petition for a writ of certiorari that "... the issues ... have been accorded full consideration by the Court" was mere sham to disguise the Court's

self-conversion into a Supreme Court by means of its Local Rule 13(c), inasmuch as the jurisdiedictional 12(h)(3) dismissal of my action had no arguable basis whatsoever. The slightest "consideration" would have brought out the fact that Government's sucess so far was based on multiple frauds, in addition to the forgery used by the Solicitor General in the Supreme Court, particularly after I pointed out the frauds to the Court of Appeals in my petition for rehearing.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals demonstrates complete collapse of the Federal judicial system, at least in the DC Circuit, by exemplifying the finality of the District Court decisions regardless of how corrupt or ignorant a district judge may be. This denial of the right to some judicial review is not only illegal and unconstitutional; it violates the most fundamental, universal principle of jurisprudence.

This situation falls squarely within Rule 19(1)(b), "Where a court of appeals ... has so far

departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings ... as to call for an exercise of this court's power of supervision."

I certify that this petition is presented in good faith and not for delay and that it is restricted to the grounds above specified.

Respectfully submitted.

June 1974.

Michael N. Mervin
Attorney pro se

This is to certify that I have served the foregoing petition for rehearing by depositing three copies thereof in a US mail box, with first class postage prepaid, addressed to the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530.

June 27, 1974.

Michael N. Mervin
Attorney pro se